

REMARKS

Claim 19 has been canceled as a duplication thereby overcoming the Examiner's objection. Claim 20 has been amended to obviate the Examiner's rejection under 35 USC 112. New claims 30 and 31 correspond to original claims 25 and 26. Claim 1 has been amended by incorporating the limitations of claim 7 into claim 1. Dependencies have been corrected on the remaining amended claims.

Claims 1, 5-9, and 13-29 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Sugano et al. (JP 2002-097465). According to the Examiner:

Sugano et al. discloses naphthacene derivatives as dopants in luminescent layers of organic electroluminescent devices (see abstract). The naphthacene derivatives 150, 152, and 154 (see par 46) as well as 220, 222, and 224 (see par. 59) read upon instant formula (I). The naphthacene derivatives are contained in a host in an amount of 0.001% to 50% by weight (see par. 65) per instant claims 5, 6, 22 and 23. Although Sugano et al. does not show specific formulas in the tables according to formulas (II), (III), and the compounds of claims 13-16, 21, and 24, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to have formed compounds according to these formulas, because Sugano et al. teaches all the required substituents (see par. 11). In addition, Sugano et al. does not show formulas 150, 152, 154, 220, 222, and 224 in an example where a device is formed using these specific compounds; however, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to have selected these compounds for the luminescent layer of a device, because Sugano et al. clearly teaches these compounds as luminescent materials for a luminescent layer. Per instant claim 17, Sugano et al. discloses the host may comprise an amine compound (see par. 66) including alpha-NPD (see examples). Since Sugano et al. teaches naphthacene derivatives according to formula 1, the property limitations of claims 20, 25, and 26 are deemed to be inherently met by the Sugano et al. naphthacene derivatives. Per instant claims 27-29, Sugano et al. teaches the EL component is used for a flat light source or a display (see par. 1). **[emphasis supplied]**


Present Claim 1 has been narrowed due to the added limitations of formula (2). The comparative data in the application demonstrate that selecting

compounds within formula (2) are advantageous over other compounds within the teachings of the cited art. In the Sugano reference, R1 through R12 can be any one of many substituents such as hydrogen, aryl or halogen. It appears that Sugano prefers that at least seven of the R1-R12 groups are non-hydrogen groups. Formula (2) of the invention cannot contain more than 6 substituent groups so is distinguishable. Further, the comparative examples of the application containing aryl and halogen groups are shown to be disadvantageous in that the wavelength of maximum emission as shown in Tables 1, 2, and 3 is desirable longer than that for the comparison compounds. This selection and this result could not have been predicted from the cited reference. In summary, the compounds of the present claim are not within the general teachings of Sugano and the compounds of the present invention are demonstrated to be of unexpected spectral properties compared to similar rubrene derivatives outside the present claims.

The remaining claims are patentable in view of the allowability of amended claim 1.

The Examiner is respectfully requested to withdraw the outstanding rejection and to pass the subject application to Allowance.

Respectfully submitted,



Attorney for Applicants
Registration No. 25,518

Arthur E. Kluegel/dlm
Telephone: 585-477-2625
Facsimile: 585-477-1148
Enclosures

If the Examiner is unable to reach the Applicant(s) Attorney at the telephone number provided, the Examiner is requested to communicate with Eastman Kodak Company Patent Operations at (585) 477-4656.